



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/002,413 01/02/98 ALLEN

R 8661-010-999

KAREN ZACHOW  
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP  
755 PAGE MILL ROAD  
PALO ALTO CA 94304-1018

HM22/0222

EXAMINER

WILSON, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1633

15

DATE MAILED:

02/22/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Advisory Action

Application No.

09/002,413

Applicant(s)

Allen et al.

Examiner

Wilson, Michael C.

Group Art Unit

1633

## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

a) ☒ expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Feb 11, 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☒ will not be entered because:

☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).

☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).

☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The proposed claims raise new 112/2nd issues regarding the "co-administered" cells in claim 6. It is unclear whether they are RPE cells or the second cells proposed in claim 3.

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

the proposed claims have not been entered and applicants provide many arguments based on the proposed claims. Ye et al. does not teach RPE were identified at 8 mo. after transplantation as newly argued. The pending claims (see

☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 3-16, 18, 19, and 21-23

☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☒ Other remain rejected under 112/1st for reasons of record. The 112/2nd rejections remain for reasons of record. The markush groups remain improper because the skilled artisan could not determine the scope of the claim for infringement or examination purposes as newly argued under 112/2nd. The 102 and 103 art rejections remain for reasons of record.

JOHN L. LEGUYADER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800

1633